DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 172 SP 036 444

AUTHOR Berkeley, Cary
TITLE Professional Development Schools: An Annotated Bibliographic Resource.
INSTITUTION California State Univ., Sacramento. Inst. for Education Reform.
PUB DATE Sep 95
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Annotated Bibliographies; Case Studies; *College School Cooperation; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Principles; Elementary Secondary Education; Governance; Higher Education; Information Centers; Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; *Program Development
IDENTIFIERS Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

The 47 references annotated in this bibliography reflect a range of authors, modes of publication, and issues related to professional development schools (PDSs). For the most part, the entries are longer and more detailed than typical annotations. Collectively, the resources that are presented were selected to provide a broad overview of a core of relevant literature. Among the sources covered in the bibliography are case studies, journal articles, project descriptions, bibliographies, newsletters, research reports, critiques, and concept papers. Issues and topics include finance, collaboration, program start-up, governance, accountability, teacher development, and restructuring and school reform. Most of the references described in the bibliography were published between 1986 and 1995 although a few have earlier publication dates. These earlier works generally do not explicitly address PDSs; they are included because they discuss some aspect of the context, background, or debate on the PDS concept. The introduction identifies five institutional sources of information on professional development schools and briefly outlines the goals and characteristics of PDSs. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 172

INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION REFORM

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS:
AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIC RESOURCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. K. Berri

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Cary Berkeley
Reasearch Associate

September 1995

California State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street
*Sacramento, CA.95819-6018 * Telephone (916)278-4600*

S 1836404

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATION REFORM

is a newly created university-based policy center focusing on elementary and secondary school issues. Located on the California State University, Sacramento campus, the Institute is supported by the CSU Chancellor's office. Its goal is to link the university and state policy makers with important developments and concerns within the K-12 education community. The Institute's staff includes:

- Gary K. Hart, Director
- Susan K. Burr, Associate Director
- Cary Berkeley, Research Associate
- Candy Friedly, Office Manager

Introduction

Education reform has been a hot topic in the United States in the past decade, and improvement of teacher training has been a part of that discussion, though generating less public and media attention than many other areas. Within the world of teacher education, reformers have sharply criticized the status quo, and have proposed strategies for improvement. One answer is the professional development school, still more concept than reality.

Broadly analogous to a clinical hospital, a professional development school is a K–12 school in which university professors of education, veteran K–12 teachers, and those in training to become K–12 teachers work together. Educators in universities and school districts have much to teach and learn from each other. Their shared work includes teaching the students at the school, training future K–12 teachers, and collaborative research into educational questions. The teachers in training have the opportunity to learn best practices from each other, university professors, and veteran teachers. The university professors have excellent opportunities for research, learning from new and experienced practitioners. The veteran teachers can train their future colleagues, reflect on their teaching, and explore effective practices with other professionals at the school site. Because collaboration between K–12 personnel and university researchers has rarely been truly equal, a professional development school provides a means by which control of the school, its funding and governance, are shared by the university and school district.

The above suggests the essence of a professional development school. A handful of definitions of this new concept are included in the text below, and readers may prefer to synthesize this material themselves. However, whatever form they take, PDSs should have the flexibility to reflect the varying communities of educators in which they are formed. Reform in several parts of the country has already coalesced into a vision of a new institution, recognizable despite local variations in many new schools and programs.

Given space and time for creation, in the long run professional development schools are likely to resemble each other in essential ways, just as discussion of education reform in general has produced similar ideas from many quarters. During the development of the clinical hospital, and despite negative prejudices on both sides, medical schools and hospitals across the country merged in strikingly similar ways. [1] One day the history of the professional development school may echo this story.

Terminology

Nearly everyone with a word to say about professional development schools makes it a new term, so long lists of phrases for each piece of the concept have accumulated. For clarity, the notes below use a consistent set of terms. Inevitably, of course, some people have used the words below in different senses than those intended here. Here, the person in training to be a K–12 teacher is called a **novice**; the veteran K–12 teacher is a **teacher**; and the professor of education at a university is a **professor**. Where the focus is on the interaction between novices and those who train them, the term **supervisor** includes anyone acting in this role, whether professor or teacher. The schools, whether known in the literature as professional practice, partnership, partner, clinical, professional, key, or practice schools, are called **professional development schools**, or **PDSs**. The term **student** refers only to the young people taught in the school, not to the teachers in training.

Selection and style of bibliographic entries

This bibliography does not cover the complete PDS literature, production of which has outpaced development of the schools themselves; selections have been chosen to cover

[1] Kenneth Ludmerer, *Learning To Heal: The Development of American Medical Education* (New York: Basic Books, 1985) 226.

a range of authors, modes of publication, and issues related to PDSs. Some items that do not explicitly discuss PDSs have been included as part of the context, background, or debate on the concept. Most entries are much longer than those in a typical scholarly annotated bibliography, in an effort to give a fuller and sometimes more evaluative picture of content than that available, for instance, in some ERIC abstracts. Thus, entries may include material such as any lists of key concepts or principles that the author has chosen to highlight, professional affiliations of the authors as given in their publications, details of the places and institutions where work has taken place, and, sometimes, evaluative judgments. Where lists are given, their contents are sometimes taken directly from the text and sometimes paraphrased. These entries are not meant as thorough summaries of the literature, since they have been focused on PDS issues; nor do they repeat the basic definition of a PDS, as the more general ERIC abstracts must. Rather, they are meant to provide a broad introduction to and overview of a core of relevant literature.

A few collections of essays have been included below. Rather than breaking each collection up and scattering its contents throughout the bibliography, with repeated references to the volume, the articles included have been indented, set off with bullets, and listed in the order in which they appear in the collection. A number of articles have been published two or three times; they are cross-referenced here.

The fourteenth edition of the Chicago Manual has been used for style, with one major modification, a shortened style for references to ERIC publications. The final element in most bibliographic entries below is a number referring to the ERIC database of documents and journal articles, maintained by the U.S. Department of Education. ERIC can be accessed on CD-ROM at many university libraries and on the World Wide Web at several locations. Each bibliographic entry with an ERIC number has been abstracted in the ERIC database. For those looking for information, such as numerical data on PDS participants, that is not provided below, the ERIC abstracts may be of help. Where the item is a collection of articles, the ERIC abstract is likely to list only titles and authors.

The author of this bibliography is solely responsible for its content.

Other institutional sources of information on PDSs

The American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education houses a Clinical Schools Clearinghouse, an Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse in the national network of educational centers sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education (Ismat Abdal–Haqq, Coordinator, Clinical Schools Clearinghouse, One Dupont Circle, Suite 610, Washington, DC, 20036–1186). The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, in Washington, DC, is conducting a project. The National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST), in New York City, is developing a bibliography of PDS literature, and publishes a newsletter, *PDS Network News*. The Holmes Group, based in East Lansing, Michigan, publishes a newsletter for members, *The Forum.* The National Network for Educational Renewal, based in Seattle, Washington, publishes a newsletter, the *Center Correspondent,* as well as occasional papers on the PDSs in the network.

Abdal-Haqq, Ismat. "Professional Development Schools: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected ERIC Resources." *Journal of Teacher Education* 43, no. 1 (January–February 1992): 42–45. EJ 446 602.

Abdal-Haqq, of the Clinical Schools Clearinghouse, an Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse, reviews seventeen items of PDS literature, five of which are reviewed in this bibliography. She includes six PDS case studies, three articles on the need for collaboration in PDSs, and eight overviews of the concept of the PDS.

———. "Professional Development Schools and Educational Reform: Concepts and Concerns." In ERIC database [World Wide Web]. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1991 [cited September 1991]. ED 335 357.

This 1991 digest of PDS literature cites a list of principles for PDSs and of concerns about them. The principles listed are:

1. Analogy with the clinical hospital, in the training of teachers, development of professional standards, and conducting of educational research.
2. Involvement of the entire school in novice training
3. Reflection of the community's geographic, ethnic, and economic diversity.
4. Low numbers of PDSs relative to the total number of schools.
5. Collaboration between universities and school districts.

The concerns are funding, faculty incentives to participate, problems with school and university cultures, and competition for what are stated to be "relatively few" positions for novices.

Anderson, C. Raymond, ed. ***Voices of Change: A Report of the Clinical Schools Project.*** Washington: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1993. ED 353 252.

In her "orientation" to the Clinical Schools Project, Martha Mead describes how the Ford Foundation sponsored PDSs in seven areas.

Dade County, FL
Louisville, KY
Gorham, ME
New York City, NY
Pittsburgh, PA
Rochester, NY
Seattle, WA

Richard Clark, then a superintendent in Bellevue, Washington, echoes many reformers in describing the emergency in public and teacher education and the importance of professional development schools. The bulk of this paper is extracts from comments on their PDS experience by participants at all levels: novices, administrators, teachers, principals, and professors. Some give a powerful sense of why participants might be both excited and frightened by the challenges of a PDS.

Berg, Marlowe, and Cheryl Ahern-Lehmann. "Reform in Supervision: Can it Create Lasting Change?" *CASCD Journal* (California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development) 5, no. 2: 4–8.

Berg and Ahern-Lehmann describe a 1985–1988 project of San Diego State University and several school districts, a collaborative experiment with a new way of supervising novices and encouraging them to reflect on their work. Training institutes encouraged professors and teachers to work together in supervision and evaluation of novices. Two years later,

surveys reported 99% use of reflective processes in supervision; the respondents were tested for their knowledge of the processes as well as asked if they used them. Supervisors reported that the program helped them to be clear, objective, and supportive in their work with novices. Such a successful program could work well as a precursor to or component of a PDS.

Berg, Marlowe, and Diane Steese Murphy. "Can We Mass-Produce a College/School Partnership for Professional Practice?" *Action in Teacher Education* 14, no. 1 (spring 1992): 57–61.

Berg and Murphy describe the Model Education Center, a PDS founded in 1984 by San Diego State University and Cajon Valley Union School District. The award-winning program has been highly successful in training good teachers.

Goals of the program include:

1. On-site training and supervision of novices
2. Collaboration of professors and teachers
3. Demonstration of extraordinary teaching
4. Collaboration of the university and district

The program's more innovative practices were supported in part by grants. Berg and Murphy conclude that the major barrier to the growth and propagation of PDSs is financial, and emphasize the need for commitment and trust among all involved.

Brainard, Frank. ***Professional Development Schools: Status As Of 1989.*** Seattle: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1989. Occasional Paper 9. ED 338 568.

Brainard's brief history of practice teaching reaches back to fifteenth-century England but jumps quickly to the Holmes report of 1986 (included in this bibliography) and to four later treatments of the concept of the PDS. By a telephone survey, he reviewed PDSs at 21 universities, 20 of which were members of either the Holmes Group or the Ford Foundation group of PDSs. The questions he used in his telephone interviews are included, and may be a useful starting point for internal and external evaluation of PDSs. Very few schools were even close to meeting his fourteen requirements for a real PDS. None satisfied them.

1. Autonomy from the district, for setting policy and guidelines
2. Inclusion of all age levels, K–12.
3. "Unrestricted, long-term, protected funding." (31)
4. Joint responsibility of the university and district for logistics and curriculum.
5. Reflection among students, novices, and teachers of ethnic diversity and at-risk populations
6. No tracking of students
7. Commitment of all staff to teacher training, so that teachers make administrative and curricular decisions and novices get real responsibility.
8. Support for experimentation
9. Time and money for reflection by teachers and novices
10. Regular meetings of teachers, professors, and novices.

11. Extention of the education school to the PDS, so that professors make the effort to teach in the PDS
12. Rewards for teachers' and professors' participation
13. Sharing theories and practices with other schools and districts
14. System of evaluation

Clark, Richard. "Financing Professional Development Schools." *PDS Network News* (National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching) 2, no. 2 (spring 1995): 1–4, 7.

Clark heads a task force on PDS costs, located at the National Center for Educational Renewal. He notes that if he thinks about PDSs one way, he concludes that they would save the country $1.2 billion, but that if he thinks about them differently, they seem likely to cost the same amount. Costs need to be differentiated between those of school districts and of universities, and in terms of start-up and running costs; benefits need to be weighed against all costs, although benefits are at least as hard to measure. Foundation funding is available for developmental costs, but rarely if ever for operating costs, and few states have yet followed Michigan and Minnesota by allocating money to PDSs. Among many open questions are potential economies of scale in teacher training and the timing of decisions to cut existing programs once they have been bettered by a PDS. District-level questions remain, too. For instance, in many professions, candidates defer their earnings to pay for their training; however, the last stages of professional preparation are often paid by the field, implying necessary change in district staff development programs. The task force work is still in progress as of September 1995.

———. "Financial Issues and Partner Schools." *Center Correspondent* (National Center for Educational Renewal) no. 8 (April 1995) 10–11.

Clark's brief description of his task force on PDS financing echoes the article discussed above. By spring 1996, he says, the task force plans to hold regional meetings. He lists among the members of the task force representatives from the Universities of West Virginia, of Washington, and of Southern Maine, Boise State University, the South Carolina Center for the Advancement of Teaching and School Leadership, Provo School District in Utah, California Polytechnic State University, and Texas A&M University.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Accountability for Professional Practice." *Teachers College Record* 19, no. 1 (fall 1989): 59–80.

Darling-Hammond, of Columbia University, sees the professionalization of teaching as a major contribution to school accountability. She gives three goals for accountability for public education: reasonable and valid standards, the means to achieve them, and ways to correct shortcomings. Describing public discussion of accountability as "cacophony," she lays out five types of accountability: political, legal, bureaucratic, professional, and market. These combine in public life, though legal and bureaucratic accountability have dominated education, and overly so. Bureaucracies, of course, tend to force students and teachers into standard molds. Professional accountability, little developed in education, requires three principles (68):

1. Knowledge as "the basis for permission to practice and for decisions"
2. The welfare of the client as the first concern
3. Collective responsibility for standards held by the profession

PDSs can be models for accountability, gates for entrance to the field, and centers for research on the standards that the profession should enforce. They train teachers, develop

a vision of what a trained teacher knows and does, and enforce standards. These standards may be enforced by hierarchical regulations, personnel evaluation, review procedures for parents, and reporting to the general public. As PDSs are gradually developed, teaching should become increasingly "client-oriented and knowledge-based." (78)

Darling-Hammond, Linda, ed. ***Professional Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession.*** New York: Teachers College Press, 1994. ED 364 996.

In her foreword, Judith Lanier of Michigan State University praises the following essays for their "clarification of the inter-related purposes of PDSs." (ix)

- **Darling-Hammond, Linda. "Developing Professional Development Schools: Early Lessons, Challenge, and Promise." 1–27.**

  Darling-Hammond surveys the potential and pitfalls of PDS work. She notes that teaching is still only quasi-professional, that beginning teachers are poorly prepared and supported, and that calls for school reform will need more skilled teachers. PDSs could reduce attrition among teachers, especially beginning teachers, and could improve teacher training and practice, to keep pace with the demands placed on teachers by school reform. By doing this, they would contribute to school reform in every aspect in which teachers are involved in schools. Because PDSs require institutions to collaborate, they threaten the prejudices and perceived security of many needed participants. Because they need to attract and keep talented people, they need money. Because they need to become part of what is required of new teachers, and because they need to be coordinated with the many energetic reform projects happening in schools, they require state policy changes, coordination, and planning.

- **Miller, Lynne, and David Silvernail. "Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a Professional Development School." 28–49.**

  Miller and Silvernail, both of the University of Southern Maine, present a case study of the Wells Junior High School, in its second year as a PDS. The superintendent of the Wells School District has committed it to school restructuring; the school was a member of the NEA Mastery in Learning Project. The university abolished the undergraduate education degree in 1989 to plan a fifth-year program, and invited teachers from the public school to help plan this program. The resulting Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP), has the following PDS characteristics:

  1. Joint coordination by a university and district representative
  2. Innovative and collaborative admissions process, including interviews with cooperating teachers, with the size of the class determined by the field placements available, not the number of applicants.
  3. Novices grouped in cohorts
  4. Novices follow the school calendar, not the university calendar
  5. Novices focus on building teams
  6. Novices integrate theory and practice throughout the program

7. Teacher voices are respected and heard
8. Graduate courses taught on-site by professors and teachers
9. Novices extensively supervised
10. Novices urged to reflect continually

Activities required to support the new PDS activities of the school included training for teachers involved, videotaped observations, and the reflection spurred in teachers by watching novices work. Some professors remain concerned about who holds the ultimate responsibility for teacher education under this program.

- **Grossman, Pamela. "In Pursuit of a Dual Agenda: Creating a Middle Level Professional Development School." 50–73.**

Grossman, of the University of Washington, describes the Lark Creek Middle School, a PDS that was four years old in 1992–3 and is part of John Goodlad's network. The principal committed the school to a PDS grant proposal. Principles developed by the planning committee were:

1. All members of the school community are learners.
2. The "central purpose" of the PDS is to make sure all members continue learning. (54)
3. The PDS explores new educational roles, responsibilities, and structures.
4 Teachers lead, and their leadership changes over time and is collegial.
5. Parents, students, professors, teachers, principals, and other educators are all part of the team.
6. Dialogue and inquiry are central.
7. We expect to make time for professional development.
8. The school must foster innovation as a part of teaching.
9. All educators share the responsibility to do research and to demonstrate good practice.
10. All educators share the responsibility to spread what is learned to the wider community.
11. The PDS is "a multi-site center, unlimited by school buildings." (55)

Grossman describes the novice training, work of teachers, teacher leadership roles, and administration and funding of the PDS. The major changes happening at the PDS affect school culture: "greater collegiality, professional responsibility, and communication." (61) New groupings, such as an instructional council and a site committee, were formed; novices cooperated with teams of teachers rather than a single teacher. The school as a whole adopted the principles of "Outcome-Based Education" and the control theory of William Glasser. The university began to reform its entire teacher education program. Problems included the combination of several reform efforts at once, the huge load on teachers as many quick changes happened, the tendency of university members to see the PDS as a project of a few professors, and professors' wariness of not being recognized for teacher education contributions.

- **Whitford, Betty Lou. "Permission, Persistence, and Resistance: Linking High School Restructuring with Teacher Education Reform." 74–97.**

Whitford, of the University of Louisville, describes a high-school level PDS, first planned in 1987 as part of a network of 24 PDSs in the same county. The school is

also part of Theodore Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools. The six guiding beliefs developed by those who planned the PDS were:

1. The goal is student success.
2. Students need to be challenged and to persist when they fail.
3. Learning is active.
4. Teachers are leaders; principals are their leaders.
5. The district and state should provide optimal conditions and make sure the school produces optimal results.
6. The school needs motivated, competent people in a supportive environment.

The same group created 29 standards for self-evaulation by PDS faculty. Problems included "the more deliberate style" of the professors, negative feeling from those who were not part of given grant-supported activities, and a debate over whether teachers should be prepared for general service or for the particular school district, if a conflict arose. Excess supply of teachers in the area led the participants to focus more on best practice than on induction. Continuing issues include just when the reforms will become school-wide, how specialized or generalized students' academic work should become, where funding to support the reformers' long hours can be found, and how university and district personnel can learn to respect each other's different styles.

- **Snyder, Jon. "Perils and Potentials: A Tale of Two Professional Development Schools." 98–125.**

Snyder, at the University of California, Santa Barbara, reports after the third year of two PDSs, one elementary, one middle, in New York City, supported by Teachers College of Columbia University, the Ford Foundation, and the United Federation of Teachers. (The middle school is discussed as well in the subsequent article.) Before the project, Teachers College was seen as powerful and influential but not committed to New York schools; its teacher education for secondary teachers was scattered among subject-matter departments, less committed to teacher education than was the elementary department. On the other hand, the elementary school was perceived as privileged and elite, and the middle school as hostile to outsiders. The basic stated interest of the professors was the novices, of the teachers, the students, and of the principals, the teachers; the district saw a range of interests; the union focused on teachers as a group transcending these two schools. These varied priorities led to battles. In the third year, participants began to focus more on how they could cooperate, but in each institution, internal politics interfered with PDS activities and drained the energy of individual PDS participants. When gains were made, they always involved someone being willing to take on his or her own institution. Barriers included: for the union, a refusal to accept lower salaries for interns; for the professors, the structure of retention, tenure, and promotion; for principals, the need to feel in charge as teachers grow more powerful; for teachers, the absence of reward for extra work and the time taken away from students. Furthermore, non-participating teachers resented those involved.

- **Lythcott, Jean, and Frank Schwartz. "Professional Development in Action." 126–155.**

Lythcott, of Teachers College at Columbia University, and Schwartz, of this New York City PDS collaboration, describe a program called the January Experience,

developed at the PDS in the middle school that was discussed in the preceding article. In January for a one-month unit, teams of professors and teachers worked in interdisciplinary teams on jointly-chosen topics; no students in the program were excluded. Design factors were:

1. interdisciplinary teaching, not narrow subject specialties
2. multidisciplinary teaching, not a teacher alone in a room
3. team teaching with 2–5 adults per classroom
4. new modes of assessment, because class periods are combined

Themes included "the bridges of New York City," "the biomes of Mexico," "the Middle East," and "Endangered Species." Students, teachers, and novices were surveyed, and were highly positive about the program, though some students had been upset by being challenged in new ways.

- **Lemlech, Johanna, Hillary Hertzog-Foliart, and Arlene Hackl. "The Los Angeles Professional Practice School: A Study of Mutual Impact." 156–175.**

Lemlech and Hertzog-Foliart, of the University of Southern California, and Hackl, of Norwood Elementary School, Los Angeles, describe a PDS begun in 1990–1 by their institutions with funding from the American Federation of Teachers and the Exxon Foundation. The year-round school serves a Hispanic population. Initially, teachers were suspicious of the university and union. Key parts of the adjustment on all sides included recognition that professors must not always jump in to make decisions, that teachers must be committed to the school's day to day functioning, that many changes are more draining for teachers than for professors, that all parties needed patience, that teachers may be ostracized by non-PDS teachers and need a group identity to help them respond, and that teachers' own practices changed as novices' did.

- **Berry, Barnett, and Sally Catoe. "Creating Professional Development Schools: Policy and Practice in South Carolina's PDS Initiatives." 176–202.**

Berry, of the University of South Carolina, and Catoe, of Summit Parkway Middle School, Columbia, South Carolina, present a case study of the three-year-old PDS at Pontiac Elementary, one of eleven PDS sites sponsored by Berry's university and part of John Goodlad's network. The authors present data from surveys of PDS participants. They urge leaders within PDS efforts to focus on three main themes:

1. Give teachers authority and discretion, as professionals.
2. Reward collaboration.
3. Get the various networks of PDSs talking, so they can learn from each other.

- **Robinson, Sharon, and Linda Darling-Hammond. "Change for Collaboration and Collaboration for Change: Transforming Teaching through School-University Partnerships." 203–219.**

Robinson, of the U.S. Department of Education, and Darling-Hammond discuss the grounding of PDSs in collaboration and continual learning. Contrasting

attitudes to time, pace, and each other make collaboration difficult. Ten characteristics of successful collaborations are:

1. Mutual self-interest and common goals
2. Mutual trust and respect
3. Shared decision-making
4. Clear focus
5. Manageable agenda
6. Commitment from top leadership
7. Fiscal support
8. Long-term commitment
9. Dynamic nature
10. Information sharing and communication

These may be helpful guides to those developing PDSs.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, and Milbrey McLaughlin. "Policies that Support Professional Development in an Era of Reform." *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1995): 597–604.

While discussing professional development for teachers more generally, Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin connect it to PDSs, which they compare to clinical hospitals in their structure, functions, and need for special funding. Supports for teachers' professional development include:

PDSs
Opportunities to learn
Professional communities outside schools
Opportunities for professional development within schools
Policies that support these activities, in and out of schools

Davis, Michael. "When the Honeymoon is Over: Keeping Professional–Development Schools on Track." *Education Week,* 14 June 1995, 34.

Davis, a professor of education at Virginia Commonwealth University and a participant at a two-year-old PDS, briefly discusses the real difficulties of the collaboration. He points out that cooperative agreements are often set aside in times of school crisis, and argues that professors whose first priority is only their own research or training "will never be considered as anything but interlopers." Neither teachers nor professors like to hear criticism from the other group, most of the time. Despite the "long term and...not linear" difficulties faced by the project, however, he concludes that "the efforts to foster [PDSs] are worth every ounce of energy expended on both sides."

Dill, Vicky. "Support for the 'Unsupportable.'" *Phi Delta Kappan* (November 1990): 198–199. EJ 416 467.

Dill, of the Texas Education Agency, responds to John Goodlad's summary of his book *Teachers for our Nation's Schools*, by arguing that alternative certification programs already answer the problems Goodlad points out. If accepted, her argument would presumably make PDSs unnecessary.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Farber, Barry, and Carol Ascher. ***Urban School Restructuring and Teacher Burnout.*** In ERIC database [World Wide Web]. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, 1991. ED 340 812.

This digest discusses whether seven types of school reform are likely to help or hurt teacher burn-out in urban schools. Predictably, it concludes that successful reforms with support and training for teachers probably reduce their stress, while inadequate support, higher expectations and higher workload without corresponding pay may increase stress. The bibliography includes several studies of effects of school reforms on teacher burn-out, and could be helpful for the planning stages of a PDS as ways to support teachers are considered.

Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, et al. ***Are Mentor Teachers Teacher Educators?*** East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning, 1992. ED 353 251.

Feiman-Nemser and her colleagues review the California Mentor Teacher program in an alternative program in an unspecified large urban district. Their data are a training manual, transcripts of conferences between novices and teachers, and interviews with teachers about those conferences. Analyzing three examples of such conversations, they conclude that teachers who mentor in the program do not challenge the novices or require them to reflect enough. Because the program does not differ enough from the usual sink–or–swim treatment of novices, the authors conclude that the teachers who mentor cannot be considered "teacher educators." Although it challenges the alternative program's claim to improve on the status quo, this conclusion, especially in its general form, begs the question of how these or other teachers might be trained, encouraged, or allowed to be more helpful to novices.

Goodlad, John. ***Teachers for our Nation's Schools.*** San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

In this, one of three books arising from a five-year study of teaching and teacher education, Goodlad indicts teacher education in the United States. Drawing on a study of twenty-nine programs around the country, Goodlad lists nineteen conditions for better teacher education; these "postulates" are paraphrased below. As Goodlad notes, where a recommended practice sounds obvious, the reader should ask whether it actually occurs, since the study found that current teacher education fails even the simplest tests.

1. Institutions that train teachers must take that responsibility seriously.
2. Teacher education must be respected equally with other university activities.
3. Teacher education programs need identity, stability, autonomy, and money.
4. Teacher education must be the top priority of some faculty, and these professors must have responsibility for the progress of future teachers through the university program.
5. These professors must fully understand "the aims of education and role of schools in our society" and train teachers accordingly. (56)
6. These professors should recruit and select novices who are committed to teaching.

7. Novices must have or learn the skills of literacy and critical thinking.

8. Novices should be urged toward reflection on knowledge and teaching.

9. Novices must learn to identify themselves as teachers through socialization.

10. Teacher education must be carried out in the same way that public education is to be carried out by the novices, once they are teaching.

11. Novices must learn to reflect on "the nature of teaching and schooling." (59)

12. Novices must understand the tension between the interests of parents and of parents' groups and the school's role in "transcending parochialism." (60)

13. Teacher education programs must be committed to equity in access to education for all students.

14. Novices must learn about alternative educational forms and how changes in schools can happen.

15. Novices need much clinical teaching experience; programs should not accept more novices than they can provide with this experience.

16. Novices must understand the tension between what works in practice and what is suggested in theory.

17. Teacher education programs should stay in touch with their graduates both for self-evaluation and to create networks that help new entrants to the field.

18. Teacher education programs need to be free of burdensome licensing detail, and to be governed by professional accreditation.

19. State policies must not allow problems of teacher supply to lead to emergency or temporary teaching licenses.

Throughout the book, Goodlad endorses the PDS concept as a way to meet his conditions; he describes PDSs as "a necessary component" of his vision of reform in teacher education. (294) In the last chapter, he imagines the development of a PDS in a fictional setting. His National Network for Educational Renewal, based at the University of Washington, has pursued work since 1990 on development of PDSs; see work by Frank Brainard and Richard Clark, reviewed in this bibliography.

Holmes Group. ***Tomorrow's Teachers.*** East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1986. ED 270 454.

This is the first of three reports by the Holmes Group, which in 1986 was still being formed and by 1990 included leaders of education schools at 98 research-oriented universities. The group's goals in 1986 were:

1. To make the education of teachers intellectually more sound.
2. To recognize difference in teachers' knowledge, skill, and commitment, in their education, certification, and work.
3. To create standards of entry to the profession that are professionally relevant and educationally defensible.

4. To connect education schools to K-12 schools.
5. To make schools betters places for teachers to work and to learn.

To change state licensing, the report proposes dividing teachers into three groups: calling novices, in their first few years of teaching, "instructors"; calling most teachers "professional teachers," and making it harder to become one; calling a select group of teachers "career professionals," and giving them responsibility for training novices and opportunities for specialized expertise. To change universities, the report proposes revising the undergraduate curriculum—ending education majors while improving the pedagogy and structure of undergraduate study of academic subjects. To change university schools of education, the report urges more coherent programs with advanced studies in pedagogy. The "unique training role" of PDSs is a crucial part of these reforms. (56) PDSs improve teacher training, develop professional knowledge and practice, and demonstrate productive relationships among members of the three new tiers of teachers.

———. ***Tomorrow's Schools.*** East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1990. ED 328 533.

If you read only one item discussed in this bibliography, read this well written, reasonably brief, and nearly comprehensive report. This second Holmes report lays out the group's six principles for PDSs:

1. Teaching and learning for understanding
2. Creating a learning community
3. Commitment to equity in education for all children
4. Continuing learning by all adults involved with schools and education schools
5. Thoughtful long-term inquiry into teaching and learning
6. Inventing a new institution

A final chapter of advice on starting PDSs contains brief discussions of each item on a thorough list of problem areas: definitions of a PDS, shared initiative for starting one, ways to catch the attention of arts and sciences faculty, regulatory problems, cost analyses, an experimental attitude to school choice, the possibilities for replication of PDS activities elsewhere, problems of burn-out, how to build enough PDSs to handle all student teachers, and how to ensure long-term commitment.

———. ***Tomorrow's Schools of Education.*** East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, 1995.

The third Holmes report describes necessary changes in schools of education. Goals for these schools are:

1. To make education schools accountable to the profession and the public for the performance of their graduates as novices and teachers
2. To make research, development, and demonstration of quality learning a primary mission
3. To connect education schools with the K-12 community and school leaders at all levels, working toward higher standards
4. To recognize interdependence and common purposes in preparing people for schools
5. To make education schools better places for learning
6. To center all work on professional knowledge and skill for educators who serve children and youth
7. To contribute to education policy

The report strongly criticizes many education schools and their faculties for their distance from and widespread disdain for public schools. They are urged to work more closely with public schools, in PDSs and in other ways, to improve their development of educational knowledge, the teaching profession, and educational policy. Commitment to diversity, responsiveness to all members of the education school, and attention to a core of professional knowledge in education (requiring almost everyone in the community to begin as a teacher) are other key elements.

The authors sharply criticize many "cheap copies" of PDSs that have sprung up since their 1986 report. "The PDS is no McDonald's franchise to be set in place ready to operate simply by acquiring the proper equipment and following the rules in a manual. Sweat and tears make the PDS. It is as much a process as a place..." (79) PDSs have a special mission where schools face poverty. They provide professors with opportunities for more relevant research and involvement in K-12 schools, and can help to set the educational standards that the public has been demanding. The Holmes Group's PDS agenda for member schools of education has four parts:

1. Creation of at least one full-fledged PDS per school of education
2. Standards for evaluation of the PDS or PDSs
3. Long-range plans to build a network of PDSs
4. Gathering government and private support to help institutionalize the PDSs

While calling for new accountability and direction for education schools around the country, the Holmes Group insists that PDSs must be central: "The PDS is not, we repeat, IS NOT, just another project for the education school." (86; authors' emphasis) More generally, the report notes the sluggishness of many schools of education in embracing reform; education professors were not part of the vanguard of calling for reform in the first place, and many have yet to show their professed support concretely. "And while we see progress in a number of universities, we see considerable inertia in others. Excuses abound—not enough time, not enough money, not enough people to take on the tasks, not enough cooperation from the outside. The rhetoric amounts to a lack of will." (88)

———. ***Report of January 1993 Annual Meeting Discussion.*** [World Wide Web: available as of August 23, 1995].

This World Wide Web posting, originally an e-mail document addressed from Helen Geiger at Michigan State University to multiple recipients of a Holmes Group e-mail list, contains draft information from a meeting of the group during the development of the 1995 report. It offers a different perspective on the group's eventual report. (A caveat is in order; some Web sites change addresses and/or content regularly, and searching by keywords is the best route.)

Levine, Marsha, ed. ***Professional Practice Schools: Linking Teacher Education and School Reform.*** New York: Teachers College Press, 1992. ED 347 156.

In a foreword, Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers describes the union's work on the concept of the PDS. In her introduction, Levine, of George Washington University, outlines the essays, listing the questions asked in their development. Mary Kennedy's essay on "Establishing Professional Schools for Teachers" is included in this bibliography in earlier form as part of a 1988 collection also edited by Levine. The substance of Linda Darling-Hammond's article on "Accountability for Professional Practice" appears independently in this bibliography. The substance of **Ann**

Lieberman and Lynne Miller's article, "Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools," appears independently in this bibliography.

- **Levine, Marsha. "A Conceptual Framework for Professional Practice Schools."** 8–24.

As background, Levine notes the roots of the PDS in John Dewey's progressive education movement, parallels with the development of clinical hospitals after Abraham Flexner's report on medicine, and details of Flexner's involvement with education and Dewey's influence on him. Her basic assumptions underlying the PDS concept are:

1. Schools' primary goal is to support students' learning, academic and social.
2. Learning is an active process that happens in different ways and at different rates.
3. Professional teaching is knowledge-based, reflective, and inquiring.
4. Schools must work for equity and high standards.
5. A PDS is a community of learners, students and teachers.
6. To teach differently, teachers must be taught differently.

Levine then summarizes work by Holly Houston, discussed in this bibliography as part of a 1988 collection also edited by Levine.

- **Pechman, Ellen. "Child as Meaning Maker: The Organizing Theme for Professional Practice Schools."** 25–62.

Pechman, of Policy Studies Associates (Washington, DC), discusses theories of children's learning as they relate to PDSs. Three assumptions about children's cognition are fundamental:

1. Children are natural learners.
2. Learning is a social and group experience, requiring interaction.
3. The purpose of education is to connect children to their culture and community.

Changing family structures, growing racial and ethnic diversity, growing poverty, increasing diversity in student ability, and the spreading need for more education have all affected the student pool. Various theorists of intelligence have differentiated among types of intelligence that people may possess and develop as well as typical differences among age groups; nevertheless all children need "psychological safety, esteem and self-worth, connectedness with adults and peers, caring guidance, intellectual competence and achievement, applied and varied learning experiences, and role models and values." (39) PDSs may respond to these learning needs in four ways:

1. Reorient teaching to focus on "essential learning processes," not lists of skills.
2. Make teachers more responsive to children by leading them to reflect.
3. Teach the next generation of teachers to focus not on "products" but on students' needs.
4. Foster collegiality and trust.

- **Houston, Holly. "Institutional Standard-Setting in Professional Practice Schools: Initial Considerations." 124–132.**

Minimal requirements for PDSs should include:

1. Quality of student performance
2. Teachers' orientation to educational problem solving
3. Emphasis for novices on experimentation and reflection
4. Understanding of individual responsibilities

- **Neufeld, Barbara. "Professional Practice Schools in Context: New Mixtures of Institutional Authority."** 133–168.

Neufelt, of Education Matters, Incorporated, and the Harvard Graduate School of Education, looks at the state and local institutional context for the creation of PDSs, particularly in Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, and Florida. State policy varies in terms of how mandates are used, how specifically state law treats teacher education, and how states "treat teachers as individuals or schools as work organizations." (136) Collaborations between schools and universities raise potential problems at many levels. School districts may need: to defend the educational goals of PDSs, to reconcile PDS efforts with other reform efforts, and to study the effectiveness of PDSs. Principals may need: a role in deciding to become and in staffing a PDS, assistance in overseeing and implementing changes, and district support. Funding and evaluation will be necessary. Professors need new workloads, job security if their traditional work is assigned to other participants, and incentives to participate, particularly if they are professors of arts and sciences, not education. Many new ideas about how to teach are not widespread, and are not likely spontaneously to occur, even in newly created PDSs.

State policies may focus on "rational planning," "market incentives," or "political interaction." (150) Helpful policies will:

1. Help collaborations develop locally
2. Not obstruct new roles for teachers in teacher education
3. Foster local authority to prepare and evaluate supervisors of novices
4. See teaching as inquiry
5. See teachers as researchers as well as recipients of research reports
6. Consider the school as the unit of reform

Major PDS-related issues for state policy are regulation of teacher education, school structure, and attitudes to educational research and knowledge. Neufeld briefly outlines and compares programs and policies in New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. She concludes by listing necessary conditions for PDSs:

1. Teachers and administrators must want to create a PDS
2. Teachers and professors must want to work together on a PDS
3. The school of education and the K-12 school must want to form a PDS
4. Local authority must determine the teacher education work that happens in the PDS.
5. Local authority must assess the work of the PDS, seeing teaching as reflective.
6. State policies must help or permit school reorganization

7. State policies must help or permit local collaborations
8. State policies must help or permit work by teachers as supervisors
9. State policies must view teaching as inquiry.

Levine, Marsha, et al. ***Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model.*** 1. Washington: American Federation of Teachers, 1988. ED 313 344.

This publication, by the Center for Restructuring of the AFT Educational Issues Department, includes papers commissioned by a task force on the PDS concept. The substance of the introduction and first article appear in Levine's 1992 collection of essays, included above. The substance of Linda Darling-Hammond's article on "Accountability for Professional Practice" appears independently in this bibliography. Two further articles are discussed below.

- **Houston, Holly. "Professional Practice Schools: How Would We Know One if We Saw One? A Guide to Self-Assessment." 103–117.**

Houston's nine standards for a professional practice school are listed below. She suggests that they be graded on a scale including the responses "exemplary," "adequate," "provisional," "below standard," and "not applicable." (105)

1. Multiple ways of checking students' learning.
2. Requirement of knowledge and know-how for teachers.
3. Teacher knowledge of the institution, its mission, and their own roles and duties.
4. Governing body located at the school itself, with written policies and an accessible appeals process
5. Assessment for students, new and veteran teachers, administrators, and support staff
6. Provision for professional development related to assessment and the school's goals
7. Adequate resources, managed well and only at the school site
8. Opportunities for experimentation and reflection by novices
9. Orientation to research

- **Kennedy, Mary M. "Establishing Professional Schools for Teachers." 119–153.**

This analysis of the nature of professional expertise is fuzzy in places, but leads to a series of requirements for a PDS, usefully focused on the type of learning that is to be fostered there. Citing her 1987 paper, not separately **reviewed here**, Kennedy divides professional expertise into four types:

1. technical expertise (suturing a wound; suppressing a student disruption)
2. application of concepts
3. analysis and interpretation (choosing and applying a legal precedent; interpreting a student's passivity)
4. deliberate action on the basis of experience.

The first two involve learning "an explicit body of content" and should be required of novices. (122) Most professional schools, such as medical schools, teach such content and then teach practice. Law schools are good at teaching analysis, the

third type. The fourth, deliberate action, can only be taught by feedback that comes while the learner is still grappling with the problem, and is appropriate to the PDS.

To highlight the nature of deliberate action, Kennedy runs through fourteen ways of training teachers, including study groups, intern seminars, and case analysis, and shows how most do not train for deliberate action. Given her discussion of deliberate action, Kennedy suggests certain requirements for a PDS.

1. Novices need responsibilities that require them to deliberate.
2. Novices need time to deliberate.
3. Supervisors should monitor the novices' deliberations.
4. Supervisors should influence the novices' deliberations.
5. Supervisors should try to infuse content into the novices' thinking.
6. Novices should have limited and focused jobs.
7. Every classroom should have a full-time teacher.
8. The PDS should employ full-time supervisors.
9. The supervisors employed should cover a range of subject areas.
10. The ratio of supervisors to novices must be adequate.
11. The schedule should both allow teachers to establish a rhythm and should allow novices opportunities for involvement.
12. Novices should get frequent feedback and the chance to try a whole rotation of activities.
13. The criteria for selecting supervisors should include knowledge of content and ability to teach adults, not the number of years teaching or formal degree held.

Kennedy implies that a novice might be supervised only by professors, without teacher input; her term is "mentor," and she suggests that whether professors could be mentors is an open question. (151)

Levine, Marsha, et al. ***Professional Practice Schools: Building a Model.*** 2. Washington: American Federation of Teachers, 1990. ED 324 299.

The papers included in this document have been included, slightly altered, in a 1992 book, also edited by Levine, and included in this bibliography.

Lieberman, Ann. "Practices that Support Teacher Development: Transforming Conceptions of Professional Learning." *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1995): 591-596.

Lieberman discusses some implications of PDS approaches to teacher education. Teachers need a role in developing educational theory, bringing them new roles, structures, and tasks. They need organizations that are bigger than individual schools, and opportunities to meet and work together. In these and other ways, teachers may learn actively, in exactly the way they are currently expected to urge their students to learn.

Lieberman, Ann, and Lynne Miller. "Teacher Development in Professional Practice Schools." *Teachers College Record* 92, no. 1 (fall 1990): 105–122. EJ 415 847.

Lieberman and Miller say that PDSs "exist as part of public school systems, are governed by lay boards of education, and serve public school populations." (105). They cite five essential elements of a culture of teacher inquiry:

1. Norms of colleagueship, openness, and trust
2. Opportunities and time for disciplined inquiry
3. Teacher learning of content in context
4. Reconstruction of leadership roles
5. Networks, collaborations, and coalitions

Activites of teacher development that are promising for PDSs include study groups, research projects, curriculum writing, peer observation, case conferences, program evaluation, experimentation, resource centers, and participation in outside events and organization, all by teachers.

Little, Judith Warren. "Norms of Collegiality and Experimentation: Workplace Conditions of School Success." *American Educational Research Journal* 19, no. 3 (fall 1982): 325–340. EJ 275 511.

Looking at four successful and two less successful schools, Little investigates patterns of social interaction among teachers. Conclusions of this "focused ethnography" are that staff development, the effort to get teachers to study and modify their own teaching, is most successful in schools where self-analysis, evaluation, and experimentation already happen. Further, when teachers are asked to criticize themselves and each other, and to change in response, they tend to want more stability and security than some urban schools can provide. Little's descriptions of places where teachers feel more and less comfortable with such reflection helps to fill in a picture of the activities that a PDS could make possible.

Lyons, Nona. "Creating a Professional Development School: From Conversation to Relationships, Resolve, and Sustainability." *NCATE Quality Teaching* (National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education) 4, no. 2 (winter 1995) 4–6.

Lyons, of the University of Southern Maine, describes the Extended Teacher Education Program (ETEP) of her university and the Wells–Ogunquit Public Schools. The program includes an undergraduate minor, a year's internship, and a two-year follow-up program. The necessary flexibility and new work on the part of many participants, especially teachers and professors, makes the PDS exciting but stressful. Funding is a crucial issue; here the university pays a stipend for the teacher who works as one of two site coordinators and as a supervisor of novices.

Magrath, C. Peter. "The Great Teacher Education Talkathon." *Educational Record* (fall 1986): 7–11. EJ 347 454.

This response to the first Holmes Group report (included in this bibliography) criticizes the report for narrow scope and for limitations of its reform proposals. According to Magrath, of the University of Missouri, the Holmes report resembles many past education reform proposals in some of the very characteristics for which it criticizes them: "preaching" and "reiterating some familiar chestnuts." (9) He further criticizes the group for elitism in its composition and perspective, pointing out that although around 125 medical schools are enough for the country, far more teacher education institutions are necessary. The report's proposed designation of less-trained "instructors" as the bottom tier of the profession could support the view that any well educated person can teach, and dilute the profession further. The Holmes report ignored the important role of principals and superintendents. Rather than creating another organization, the Holmes Group, Magrath would have advocated working within existing national groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Olson, Lynn. "An Overview of the Holmes Group." *Phi Delta Kappan* (April 1987): 619–621. EJ 352 279.

This early history of the Holmes Group (the three major reports of which are included in this bibliography) describes its origins in 1983 as an informal collaboration between seventeen deans of schools of education. Judith Lanier, of Michigan State University, John Palmer, of the University of Wisconsin at Madison, and Robert Koff, of the State University of New York at Albany, were three founders. Five of the original invited universities did not join: the University of North Carolina, North Carolina State University, Vanderbilt University, and Washington University refused, and Indiana University refused to give up its education major, a necessary condition.

Tebben, Christine. ***Partners for Learning: Building Cooperation for Teacher Education.*** Report to the California Senate Education Committee. May 1994.

Tebben recommends that the California Legislature develop a grant program to fund PDSs. As a model, she profiles the Chula Vista PDS, a partnership of San Diego State University and the Chula Vista Elementary School District.

Theobald, Neil. ***The Financing and Governance of Professional Development or Partner Schools.*** Seattle: Center for Educational Renewal, University of Washington, 1990. Occasional Paper 10. ED 338 569.

In a preface to this paper, John Goodlad notes that a PDS requires extra work of all parties; teachers and principals have to train other teachers, and professors get extra duties. Goodlad points out that these additional duties may breed resentment if they are not recognized and compensated. Not everyone will or should work harder just for the joy of seeing improvement; many feel overworked in the first place.

Theobald, of Goodlad's National Center for Educational Renewal, defines educational welfare conventionally in economic terms, as a function of the welfares of everyone involved with schools. He quickly resolves a major socioeconomic question by asserting that John Rawls's priority in his famous social welfare function, raising the welfare of the least well–off member of society, "should" be the priority of PDSs. On this basis, Theobald analyses efficiency of production, requiring a flexible use of inputs, and of distribution, requiring K. Strike's three characteristics (a good outcome, a fair and legitimate process, and justice).

A PDS shifts both money and work around. Reallocation of district staff allows teachers and principals time for reflection, research, supervision, and peer review. It saves money by reducing central office costs and existing university supervision expenses; new costs vary with the number of novices per PDS and the reallocated hours per teacher. Reallocation of university staff focuses on teacher training, not just research; professors have the scheduling flexibility to adapt to more rigid K–12 schedules, but their work in PDSs must be recognized in retention, tenure, and promotion decisions if they are to have an incentive to participate. Finally, taxpayers may resent paying to train teachers who then are free to teach elsewhere, while universities may not have the financial sophistication to handle public school budgeting problems such as special education restrictions. Theobald proposes an 'independent but aligned' governance body, with funding from the district, university, and state.

———. **"Staffing, Financing, and Governing Professional Development Schools."** *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 13, no. 1 (spring 1991): 87–101. EJ 426 490.

This article incorporates much of the earlier paper discussed above. Again, Theobald advocates a Rawlsian social welfare function, and suggests improvements in efficiency of production, by more flexibility, and of distribution, while focusing on justice and fairness of process. He offers a theoretical model of the staffing changes that a PDS might require, with estimates of salaries involved for the personnel. Costs vary according to the number of novices per PDS and the number of hours freed up for teachers, whose classroom replacements must be paid. This model helps to make the concepts of shared research and collaborative supervision more concrete, by filling in the details of what might happen, when and where, in a PDS. On funding, he points out that who has the gold, makes the rules, and argues that PDSs need independent governing bodies, funded by universities and school districts. For governance, too, PDSs must be a truly collaborative effort. In conclusion he names six key factors on which the success of a PDS depends:

1. Increased efficiency of teacher preparation in PDSs to compensate for losses incurred during their founding
2. A "priority-driven distribution scheme" for the needs of each affected group (99)
3. A managerial structure that collaborates with but does not report to the university and district
4. Integration of teachers and professors into a unit with common goals, and the hiring of more teachers to free teacher time for PDS work
5. New priorities in higher education to reward professors' PDS work
6. Enough money

Wise, Arthur. "Policies for Reforming Teacher Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* (November 1990): 200–202. EJ 416 468.

Wise, of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), here responds to a summary by John Goodlad of the latter's 1990 book, *Teachers for our Nation's Schools,* which is discussed in this bibliography. Wise notes the similarities between several of Goodlad's concerns and those of NCATE. He asks whether Goodlad endorses the transfer of clinical preparation to PDSs, and notes ambiguity about the details of the relationship between PDSs and university teacher preparation programs. Wise asks other important and detailed questions about the prospects for professional accreditation as opposed to state licensure of teacher preparation programs and the value of an education major.

Wise, Arthur, Linda Darling-Hammond, and Barnett Berry. ***Effective Teacher Selection: From Recruitment to Retention.*** Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1987. ED 282 840.

In a short section of this longer work, the authors discuss and make recommendations about the induction of teachers. (92–96) Conclusions 9, 9a, and 10a of the report deal with the importance of supervised induction, the need for such programs (which might include increased teaching staffs to allow better supervision of novices, mentor teacher programs, or "specially staffed induction schools where senior teachers supervise beginning teachers"), and the need to evaluate new teachers well. (93) The benefits of such "induction schools" include:

better supervision for novices
more support during first years of teaching
better preparation for teaching
reduced attrition from teaching
a chance for teachers to be recognized and to improve
a place to evaluate new teachers
a concentration of resources and greater stability for at-risk students

Zimpher, Nancy. "Creating Professional Development School Sites." *Theory into Practice* 29, no. 1 (1990): 42–49. ED 419 242.

Before the publication of *Tomorrow's Schools*, Zimpher, an associate professor of education at Ohio State University, published this work resulting from a series of seminars held by a project steering committee of the Holmes Group. She lists barriers to PDSs including limited funding for the joint PDS effort, the poor resources of many individual K–12 schools, resistance to collaboration between districts and universities, and questions of equity and the concentration of resources in a PDS.

Useful assumptions in the selection of a PDS site include:

joint development of beliefs about how PDSs should work
finding a way to assess the progress of a PDS
focusing on areas of high need
flexibility in defining PDSs in terms of an entire building or a part of a school, the full range of subject areas taught or a departmental specialty
improving pedagogy among professors
challenging the novices
team development of curricula, involving professors and K–12 representatives
real commitment on the part of the university, balancing that of the district
rewarding the teachers involved
avoiding exploitation of the K–12 resources for research

Goals for PDS sites include:

new concepts of teaching and learning
extending the professional practice of teachers, to break down their isolation
designating teacher leadership roles
giving teachers opportunities for professional development
exploring alternative methods of assessment